

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. Why should their good fortune in owning many stations be used to bias an election for President of the United States of America? I can remember the fair-practice of allowing equal time for responses. Is that going to be allowed or invited to occur? It is one thing to air commercials for a candidate. It is another to exclusively air something produced to express the station owners' points of view. This couldn't possibly be seen as serving in the public interest.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.